

DONALD R. ANTONELLI
MELVIN KRAUS
WILLIAM I. SOLOMON*
GREGORY E. MONTONE
RONALD J. SHORE
DONALD E. STOUT
ALAN E. SCHIAVELLI
JAMES N. DRESSER
CARL I. BRUNDIDGE*
PAUL J. SKWIERAWSKI*
ROBERT M. BAUER
HUNG H. BUI*
ALFRED A. STADNICK*
*ADMITTED OTHER THAN VA

LAW OFFICES
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

SUITE 1800
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22209

TELEPHONE (703) 312-6600
FACSIMILE (703) 312-6666
email@antonelli.com

OF COUNSEL
DAVID T. TERRY
HAROLD A. WILLIAMSON*
RANDALL S. SVIKLA
GEORGE N. STEVENS*
FREDERICK D. BAILEY
DAVID C. OREN
RALPH T. WEBB*
PAUL W. BOBOWIEC*
STERLING W. CHANDLER*
PATENT AGENT
LARRY N. ANAGNOS

VIA FACSIMILE - 9 PAGES (Including This Cover)

FAX RECEIVED

Honorable Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Attention: Examiner Gary F. Paumen, Group AU 2833
Transmitted to TC2800 BEFORE FINAL Fax No. 703-872-9318

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Re: Christopher D. COMBS *et al.*, Serial No. 10/032,329
Attorney Docket No. 219.40441X00

SUBMISSION OF REPLACEMENT RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION/ELECTION

Sir:

Applicant hereby transmits the attached "REPLACEMENT RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION/ELECTION REQUIREMENT" (8 pages) in connection with the above-identified application.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION:

I hereby certify that the attached "REPLACEMENT RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION/ELECTION REQUIREMENT" (8 pages) is being FORMALLY filed in the USPTO via TC2800 BEFORE FINAL Fax No. 703-872-9318 on 3 February 2003.


Patricia J. Jaquet

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission contain confidential information belonging to the sender which is legally privileged. This information is intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity(ies) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this facsimile information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by telephone to arrange for return of the original document to us.

219.40441X00

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Christopher D. COMBS et al.

Serial No.: 10/032,329

Filed: December 31, 2001

For: ZERO MOUNTING FORCE SOLDER-FREE
CONECTOR/COMPONENT AND METHOD

Art Unit: 2833

Examiner: Gary F. Paumen

FAX RECEIVED

FEB 03 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

REPLACEMENT RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION/ELECTION REQUIREMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

3 February 2003

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed 31 October 2002 containing a Restriction/Election requirement, and the Communication mailed 3 January 2003, Applicant respectfully submits the following in connection with the above-identified application. **Applicant respectfully withdraws all statements and the election made in the Response to Restriction/Election Requirement filed 27 November 2002, and submits herewith a Replacement Response and Election.**

Applicant respectfully submits the following election and statements.

RESTRICTION/ELECTION REQUIREMENT - TRAVERSED

A restriction/election requirement has been made for the reasons beginning on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully traverses based upon the following grounds.

COMBS *et al.*, Serial No. 10/032,329

Docket No. 219.40441X00

REASONABLE NUMBER OF SPECIES, WITH GENERIC CLAIM

The Examiner has taken the following position: "1. The application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: species 1-10: Figures 2, 5A, 10A, 11, 12, 17, 21A, 22, 25, and 27, respectively." (underline emphasis added).

From the foregoing, it appears that Examiner believes that there are ten (10) patentably distinct species. This finding is in error. At most, there are three (3) species of the invention. That is, the three species are as follows:

SPECIES I - Figs. 5a, 5b, 6a, 6b, 7-9 and 12-16 (connector pin insertable into substrate hole, and rotatable to wedge in and electrically connect to substrate hole);

SPECIES II - Figs. 10a-10c (rack gear arrangement for pin rotation); and

SPECIES III - Figs. 21a, 21b and 22-27 (rack member with inclined opening for pin rotation).

An analysis of the Office Action cited species (as well as errors therein) is as follows.

In the matter of the Examiner's assertion that Figure 2 is a patentably distinct species of the invention, attention is directed to paragraph [0045], which reads in part as follows:

[0045] Attention is now directed to FIGS. 2, 3 and 4 which, when taken together along with an explanation that follows, will provide an understanding of a less advantageous arrangement involving a zero mounting force component 20 positioned above an aperture 21 in PCB 22....

COMBS *et al.*, Serial No. 10/032,329

Docket No. 219.40441X00

From the foregoing, it is clear that Figure 2 is not a species of the invention, and furthermore, there are no claims in the application that are directed to the structure of Figure 2.

Figure 5a noted by the Examiner, as well as Figures 5b, 6a, 6b, 7-9 and 12-16, are all directed to a rotating/wedgeable pin species of the invention.

Figure 10a noted by the Examiner, as well as Figures 10b, 10c and 11, are all directed to a rack gear species of the invention. Accordingly, Figures 10a and 11 are not separate species. These two figures illustrate separate physical aspects of the species, and are not separate species.

Figure 12 identified by the Examiner as a separate patentably distinct species (and Figures 13-16) is, in fact, simply illustrative of the nature of oval pins 36 and oval openings 41' of the above-discussed rotating/wedgeable pin species. That is, these Figures 12-16 belong to the same species as Figures 5a, 5b, 6a, 6b and 7-9.

Figure 17, cited by the Examiner as a patentably distinct species, as well as Figures 18, 19 and 20, are directed to a less advantageous rotating wedge connector as indicated in paragraphs [0028] thru [0031] in the specification. Accordingly, Figure 17 is not a patentably distinct species of the invention, as the Examiner has asserted.

Figures 21a, 21b, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27 are directed to and illustrate various physical aspects of an inclined opening rack member species that embodies the subject invention. It follows, therefore, that the Examiner's assertion that Figures 21a, 22, 25, and 27 are patentably distinct species of the invention is in error, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

COMBS *et al.*, Serial No. 10/032,329

Docket No. 219.40441X00

By way of summary, the subject patent application includes only three (3) species of the same invention and not ten (10) patentably distinct inventions, as the Examiner maintains.

As traversal, 37 CFR §1.141 provides that more than one species of an invention, not to exceed a reasonable number, may be specifically claimed in different claims in one application, providing the application also includes an allowable generic claim to all of the claimed species and all claims to the species in excess of one are written in dependent form or otherwise include the limitations of an allowable generic claim (underline emphasis added).

Applicant believes that Claims 1-12, 15-18 and 21-29 presently pending in this application are allowable and are generic, and that all other pending claims contain the limitations of such generic claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the election of species requirement should be withdrawn and all claims considered and allowed.

NOT INDEPENDENT AND DISTINCT INVENTIONS

As traversal, Applicant notes that 35 USC §121, the basis for a restriction and election of species requirement, provides for a restriction only if two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application. While §802.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure indicates that restriction and/or election of species may be permissible between independent or distinct inventions, such section of the is clearly erroneous in view of the plain and unambiguous language of 35 USC §121.

COMBS *et al.*, Serial No. 10/032,329

Docket No. 219.40441X00

In this connection, the above-noted section of the MPEP defines the term "independent" as meaning there is no disclosed relationship between the two or more subjects disclosed that is, they are unconnected in design, operation or effect. It is respectfully submitted that a contention cannot validly be made that the subject matter recited in the claims in issue relating to the respective embodiments of the present invention have no disclosed relationship, for if such is the case, such contentions are clearly without merit as a review of the instant specification and the claimed subject matter reveals. More particularly, to show that Applicant's claims are related, Applicant respectfully submits the following comments.

The invention in this application is directed to a zero force solder-free connector component that utilizes rotary pins that bind in corresponding openings of a PCB when the oval pins are rotated. There are a number of different mechanisms that may be employed to rotate the pins, three (3) of which are shown and appear as dependent claims in this application.

With further regard to the erroneous restriction/election position presented in the MPEP (*i.e.*, teaching restriction/election for "independent or distinct inventions", instead of the unambiguous "independent and distinct inventions" statutory language), as pointed out by Mr. McKelvey in the concurring opinion in *ex parte Hartmann*, 186 USPQ 366 (Bd. App. 1974), relying upon the Decision of *ex parte Schwarze*, 151 USPQ 426 (Bd. App. 1966) the MPEP merely provides guidelines for Examiners in the Patent Office and it does not replace, and is subservient to, applicable statutes, Rules of Practice, and prior decisions. Thus, it would appear that by virtue of the plain and unambiguous language of 35 USC §121, the statute only permits an election of species requirement between two or more independent

COMBS *et al.*, Serial No. 10/032,329

Docket No. 219.40441X00

and distinct inventions (not independent or distinct inventions) in spite of the circumlocutory argumentation of MPEP §802.01.

Furthermore, in view of the interrelationship of the inventions designated in the Office Action, and in view of the fact that each of the designated inventions are, in essence, based upon the same basic inventive concept, Applicant respectfully submits that the designated inventions are not independent and distinct to the extent required by 35 USC §121 to support a restriction requirement. In this connection, Applicant notes that a basic inventive concept of the claims in issue relates to a zero force solder-free connector component that utilizes rotary pins that bind in corresponding openings of a PCB when the oval pins are rotated. Different mechanisms also are illustrated and may be employed to rotate the pins.

Applicant respectfully submits that these differences should not be considered as rendering the respective embodiments independent and distinct to the extent required by 35 USC §121.

In summary, a review of the Office Action reveals that the Office Action has failed to clearly indicate how the subject matter recited in the respective groups of claims represents both independent and distinct inventions are required by 35 USC §121.

RELATED INVENTIONS - NO SERIOUS BURDEN FOR EXAMINATION

As traversal, presuming *arguendo* that one could establish that the subject matter recited in the claims in issue relating to the respective embodiments of the present invention relate to independent and distinct inventions as required by 35 USC §121, as pointed out in MPEP §803, if a search and an examination of an entire

COMBS et al., Serial No. 10/032,329

Docket No. 219.40441X00

application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine the application on the merits even though the application includes claims to distinct or independent inventions. A review of the Office Action reveals that such Office Action has failed to provide any indication as to how or why a search and examination of an entirety of the claims in the instant application would create a serious burden on the part of the United States Patent and Trademark Office. In fact, it is respectfully submitted that a serious burden cannot be shown at this time, owing to the fact that the claims are related as mentioned above.

PROVISIONAL ELECTION

In order to comply with the election of species requirement, Applicant provisionally elects, with traverse, for prosecution on the merits, the species of Figure 5, which includes at least Claims 1-12, 15-18 and 21-29. (It is respectfully noted that, as discussed above, this species is more accurately related to all of Figures 5a, 5b, 6a, 6b, 7-9 and 12-16.)

NO ADMISSION - RESTRICTION/ELECTION

Applicant submits that the instant response (including the comments submitted and the provisional election) is not an admission on the record that the respective species are separately distinct species and/or obvious variants.

EXAMINER INVITED TO TELEPHONE

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. area telephon 703-312-6600, to discuss an Examiner's Amendment or any

COMBS *et al.*, Serial No. 10/032,329


Docket No. 219.40441X00

other suggested actions for accelerating prosecution and moving the present application to allowance.

CONCLUSION

This Response is being filed within the one month shortened statutory period set by the Office Action mailed 3 January 2003, and therefore, no Petition for extension of time or fee is required. To whatever other extent is actually necessary and appropriate, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper to ATS&K Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (as Case No. 219.40441X00)

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Skwierawski
Registration No. 32,173
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 North Seventeenth Street, Suite 1800
Arlington, Virginia 22209-3801, USA
Telephone 703-312-6600
Facsimile 703-312-6666

FAX RECEIVED

FEB 03 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800